

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendments, claims 3-10 and 23-30 are pending in the application with claims 3-7 and 25 being independent. Claims 3 and 5 are amended. Claims 1, 2 and 11-22 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. New claims 27-30 are added. These changes are believed to add no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

At the outset, Applicant's representative, Albert J. Fasulo, II, thanks Examiner N. Diep for the courtesy of a telephonic interview held 7/13/07 during which the Restriction Requirement of 6/18/07 and the claims pending in the present application (as amended in Applicant's Reply of 3/28/07 responsive to the first Office Action dated 1/08/07) were discussed. Applicant's representative and Examiner Diep agreed that amending dependent claims 3 and 5 to include all of the features recited in claim 1 (as amended in Applicant's Reply dated 3/28/07) and all intervening claims together with canceling claims 12-18, would facilitate allowance of the application. Therefore, Applicant has amended the claims herein as discussed to facilitate allowance.

Restriction Requirement

Applicant elects, with traverse, Group I, claims 3-10, 23-24 and 27-30. Applicant traverses because the LADAR feature of non-elected claims 25 and 26 precipitating the Examiner's Restriction Requirement was already presented in original claims 4 and 6 and, therefore, should have already been searched by the Examiner in preparation of the first Office Action mailed 01/08/07.

Art Rejections

The claim rejections cited in the first Office Action of 1/08/07 are traversed.

Claims 1, 2 and 12-22

Claims 1, 2 and 12-22 are believed patentable for the reasons advanced in Applicant's Reply dated 3/28/07. Nevertheless, as mentioned above, to facilitate allowance of this application, all of these claims are canceled thereby rendering moot their respective rejections.

Claim 3

Claim 3 is rewritten in independent form to include all of the features of both claims 1 (as amended in Applicant's Reply dated 3/28/07) and 2 from which claim 3 originally depended. Claim 3 is patentable for at least all of the reasons advanced in Applicant's Reply of 3/28/07 for the patentability of claims 1 and 3.

Claim 5

Claim 5 is rewritten in independent form to include all of the features of both claims 1 (as amended in Applicant's Reply dated 3/28/07) and 2 from which claim 5 originally depended. Claim 5 is patentable for at least all of the reasons advanced in Applicant's Reply of 3/28/07 for the patentability of claims 1 and 5.

Claims 4, 6-10 and 23-26

Each of claims 4, 6-10 and 23-26 is patentable for the reasons advanced in Applicant's Reply of 3/28/07.

New Claims 27-30

New claims 27-30 are the same as claims 8-10 and 23, respectively, except the new claims depend from independent claim 5 instead of claim 1. Therefore, claims 27-30 are patentable for the same reasons claims 8-10 and 23 are patentable.

Information Disclosure Statement (IDS)


Applicant kindly requests that the Examiner acknowledge a review of each of the references listed in both of the following submittals:

- (i) the IDS filed with Applicant's Reply dated 3/28/07; and
- (ii) the subsequent IDS filed by Applicant on 4/25/07.

Conclusion

On the basis of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration and allowance of this application are believed warranted.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY
Applied Physics Laboratory

By 
Albert J. Fasulo, II
Reg. No. 43,607
Tel.: (240) 228-5639